

REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are now pending in the application. Claims 1, 18, and 22 are amended. Support for the amendments and additions can be found in the originally filed specification at the claims and at Figures 1, 3, and especially Figure 5 of the patent application, in which the boundaries are imparted different display properties (boldness and word position), and a pair of controls are provided for adjusting the boundary strengths and pause. This subject matter is also discussed at paragraphs [0027], [0028], [0030], and [0033]. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-7, 12-19, and 22-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor ("SSML: A Speech Synthesis Markup language" Speech Communication, 1996) in view of Henton ("Generating and Manipulating Emotional Synthetic Speech on a Personal computer" (1996)). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner relies on Taylor to teach a system for tuning the text to speech conversion process. The Examiner relies on Henton to teach modifying a speech feature of words by modifying display properties of the words. However, Taylor and Henton do not teach, suggest, or motivate that the speech feature is boundary strength and/or pause duration, and that the graphical indicator is a display property of a boundary between adjacent segments and/or spacing between textual contents of the adjacent segments. Independent claim 1, especially, as amended, recites, "said speech feature is at least one of boundary strength or pause duration, and said graphical

indicator is at least one of a display property of a boundary between adjacent segments or spacing between textual contents of the adjacent segments.” Independent claims 18 and 22, especially as amended, recite similar subject matter. These differences are significant.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of independent claims 1, 18, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), along with rejection on these grounds of all claims dependent therefrom.

Claims 8-11, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor (“SSML: A Speech Synthesis Markup language” Speech Communication, 1996) in view of Henton (“Generating and Manipulating Emotional Synthetic Speech on a Personal computer” (1996)) and Kobal (U.S. Pat. No. 7,099,828). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner relies on Taylor to teach a system for tuning the text to speech conversion process. The Examiner relies on Henton to teach modifying a speech feature of words by modifying display properties of the words. The Examiner relies on Kobal to teach a visual editing interface that is language independent, uses non-editable text and editable blank slots, acts as a plug in the form of an ActiveX control, uses PASR format, and employs separate communications channels for sending data. However, Taylor, Henton, and Kobal do not teach, suggest, or motivate that the speech feature is boundary strength and/or pause duration, and that the graphical indicator is a display property of a boundary between adjacent segments and/or spacing between textual contents of the adjacent segments. Independent claim 1, especially, as amended, recites, “said speech feature is at least one of boundary strength or pause

duration, and said graphical indicator is at least one of a display property of a boundary between adjacent segments or spacing between textual contents of the adjacent segments.” Independent claim 18, especially as amended, recites similar subject matter. These differences are significant.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of independent claims 8-11, 20, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of their dependence from allowable base claims.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 8, 2008

By: J. S. Brooks
Jennifer S. Brooks, Reg. No. 51,501

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

[JSB/kup]